-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ___*three*___ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Jun 20, 2000* _____.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, and 21-32* _____ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, and 21-32* _____ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.　　This correspondence is in response to the amendment filed 5/14/2001 and 3/19/01

2.　　Claims 22 and 27 have been canceled as requested.

3.　　Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, and 21 have been amended as specified.

4.　　Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 28 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Huemoeller et al.. (U.S. Patent No. 5,855,006).

5.　　Claims 24-26 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huemoeller et al.. (U.S. Patent No. 5,855,006).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.　　The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

7.　　Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 28 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Huemoeller et al.. (U.S. Patent No. 5,855,006).

Claims 5, 15 and 21: Huemoeller discloses an information processing apparatus, a method

and a computer-readable storage medium, comprising:

a search unit that searches for a pending task to be performed by the user within a

predetermined timeframe when the detector detects that the user is scheduled to depart, using:

"(T)he integration module IM functions as a database, which stores data in memory M for

retrieval on an organized basis for the calendar system CA for presentation to the user via display

D." (Col. 4, lines 55-58, emphasis added).   A search unit is an information processing feature

that <u>searches or retrieves or detects information</u> stored in a database, such as a pending task to be

performed by the user. The database stores a user's schedule, and that information <u>searched or</u>

<u>retrieved or detected</u> permit to know that the user is scheduled to depart.

Huemoeller discloses make the <u>search in a predetermined timeframe</u>:

"The personal activity scheduling apparatus AP is shown in block diagram form in FIG. 1

and comprises a calendar system CA which interconnects with the clock C of the central

processing unit CPU to <u>generate and maintain the calendars</u> described below. The

calendar system CA preferably comprises a <u>module which dynamically generates a present</u>

<u>date calendar</u>, which date is indicated by the system clock C, <u>and presents a display to the</u>

<u>user on display D of this present date calendar in the form selected by the user</u>. In

addition, at least one, and preferably a plurality of application modules TB1-TBn (also

termed time based software modules hereinbelow) are included, each of which generates

data indicative of events which may be of interest to the user. The events can be time-based or situational-based..."(emphasis added) (Col. 4, lines 17-30).

Huemoeller described search in a predetermined timeframe, such as a Daily Calendar (Col. 5, line 23-col. 7, line 21), a Weekly Calendar (Col. 7, lines 22-56), and a Monthly Calendar (Col. 7, line 56-col. 8, line 6).

Huemoeller also discloses a notifier that notifies the user of the pending task to be performed within the predetermined timeframe when the pending task is found by said search unit:

"In addition, an alarm menu AL is provided to enable the user to turn on the alarm function by selecting ("X") "Alarm" and setting the length of time prior to this scheduled event the alarm should be generated. The user can also select the type of alarm indication, from a menu of possible visual and audible alerts that can be produced by the user terminal device PC." (Col. 6, lines 35-41, emphasis added). Thus, Huemoeller discloses a menu of possible visual and audible alerts to notify the user of the pending task to be performed.

Claims 7 and 17: Huemoeller discloses an information processing apparatus and a method, comprising:

a detector that detects, based on a user's schedule, that the user is scheduled to depart from being present at the information processing apparatus and a destination of the user; using a search unit that searches for a pending task relevant to the destination of the user when said detector detects that the user is about to depart (Col. 4, lines 55-58, see discussion above in claims 5, 15 and 21); and

a notifier that notifies the user of the pending task relevant to the destination of the user (Col. 6, lines 35-41).

Claim 9 and 19:   Huemoeller discloses an information processing apparatus and a method, comprising:

a detector that detects, based on a user's schedule, that the user is scheduled to depart from being present at the information processing apparatus and a person with whom the user is scheduled to meet; using a search unit that searches for a pending task relevant to the person with whom the user is scheduled to meet when said detector detects that the user is scheduled to depart (Col. 4, lines 55-58, see discussion above in claims 5, 15 and 21); and

a notifier that notifies the user of the pending task relevant to the person with whom the user is scheduled to meet (Col. 6, lines 35-41).

Claims 23, 28 and 32: Huemoeller discloses an information processing apparatus, a method and a computer-readable storage medium, comprising:

a schedule storage, for storing a plurality of pending undertakings (Col. 2, lines 16-20);

an entry adder, that adds a new undertaking to said schedule storage (Col. 2, lines 20-24);

a search unit to search said storage for a pending undertaking relevant to the new undertaking (Col. 2, lines 12-16); and

a notifier to notify the user of the pending undertaking relevant to the new undertaking (Col. 2, line 61-Col. 3, line 2).

<center>*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*</center>

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 24-26 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Huemoeller et al.. (U.S. Patent No. 5,855,006).

Huemoeller discloses an information processing apparatus, a method and a computer-

readable storage medium, comprising a search unit that is an information processing feature that

searches or retrieves or detects information stored in a database, such as a pending task to be

performed by the user, according to Claims 23 and 28, wherein the search unit searches a pending

undertaking to be performed subsequent to the new undertaking, relevant to a person related

(with who do it) and to a location where the new undertaking is to be performed.

However, Huemoeller does not explicitly disclose that the search unit searches a pending

undertaking to be performed subsequent to the new undertaking, relevant to a person related

(with whom to do it) and to a location where the new undertaking is to be performed. The

Huemoeller's database stores a user's schedule, with the events in which the user intends to

participate. The Examiner interpretation of the registration of an **event** in the Huemoeller's

invention includes what to do in that event, with whom to do it, and where the event will occur

(Col. 6, lines 25-35, T5 and T6 in Fig. 3 and DE and EFT in Fig. 4). These are types of standard information contained in any personal agenda or scheduling. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to include these features. One would have been motivated to have the search unit search a pending undertaking to be performed subsequent to the new undertaking, relevant to a person related (with whom to do it) and to a location where the new undertaking is to be performed in order to have in one file all needed information regarding the event (when --day, time--, where --complete address--, what is needed for the perform --documents, slides, personal computer, musical instrument, etc.--, key persons contact --title, hobbies, relatives information--).

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments filled on 5/14/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11.   Applicant argues that: "... the applied art (Huemoeller) is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of detecting, based on a user's schedule, that the user is scheduled to depart from being present at an information processing apparatus..." (Page 11, lines 16-20). Applicant added: "Huemoeller is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of detecting, based on a user's schedule, that the user is scheduled to depart..." (Page 12, lines 4-6).

Examiner notes that Huemoeller discloses: "notifier that notifies a user of a pending

undertaking." Huemoeller's invention states: "(T)he integration module IM functions as a

database, which stores data in memory M for **retrieval** on an organized basis for the calendar

system CA for presentation to the user via display D." (Col. 4, lines 55-58, emphasis added).

A search unit is an information processing feature that <u>searches or retrieves or detects information</u>

stored in a database, such as a pending task to be performed by the user. The database stores a

user's schedule, and that information <u>searched or retrieved or detected</u> permit to know that the

user is scheduled to depart.

Applicant argues that Huemoeller does not disclose or suggest: "...notifying the user of a

pending task after detecting that the user is scheduled to depart..." (Page 11, lines 20-21).

Applicant added that Huemoeller does not disclose or suggest: "...notifying the user of a pending

task after detecting that the user is scheduled to depart." (Page 12, lines 7-9).

Examiner notes that Huemoeller discloses: "In addition, an alarm menu AL is provided to

enable the user to turn on the alarm function by selecting ("X") "Alarm" and setting the length of

time <u>prior to this scheduled event</u> the <u>alarm</u> should be generated. The user <u>can also select the</u>

<u>type of alarm indication</u>, from a menu of possible <u>visual and audible alerts</u> that can be produced by

the user terminal device PC." (emphasis added) (Col. 6, lines 35-41).

Thus, Huemoeller discloses a notifier that notifies a user with a menu of possible visual

and audible alerts prior about a pending undertaking event or a scheduled event.

Thus, Huemoeller anticipates all the features of independent Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19 and 21, as now amended.

12.   Applicant further argues in page 12 about the use made in the previous Office Action of Hoshino and Zhang inventions. The arguments are moots in view of the new grounds of rejection.

13.   The Examiner appreciates Applicant's attention to an error in the Form PTO-892 included with the September 12, 2000 Office Action. In fact, the document F listed on page 1 of the PTO-892 list an incorrect document number. An updated Form PTO-892 is provided with this communication.

Conclusion

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

15.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Exr. Pedro R. Kanof whose telephone number is (703) 308-9552. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Vincent Millin, can be reached on (703) 308-1065. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-1396.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

PRK- 9/24/2001.

VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100